



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,037	04/08/2004	Won-jun Koh	1572.1264	7587
21171 7590 07/08/2008 STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
PECHIE, JORGE O				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3664				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/08/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/820,037

Applicant(s)

KOH ET AL.

Examiner

Jorge O. Peche

Art Unit

3664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's argument/remarks filed on April 15, 2008, **claims 10-13** are pending and an action on the merits is as follows.

Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 10-13** have been fully considered but are moot in view of the same ground(s) of rejection. Applicant had cancelled **claims 1-9** and **14-15**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 10-13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paromtchik et al. (Pub No.: US 2002/0027652 A1)** in view of **Bartsch et al. (Patent No.: US 6,459,955 B1)**.

Regarding **claim 10**, Paromtchik discloses a method for instructing target position for mobile bodies comprising the set of:

Art Unit: 3664

- Providing a light beam (light commander) projected on a surface to command a mobile robot to a new location (see page 2, par. 25; page 4, par. 55-58, Figure 1).
- Having a memory for storing a program to correlate light beam and command signals to drive the robot to a relative position (see page 4, par. 57-58, 68; page 5, par 69-71; Figure 3).
- Detecting the position of light beam in a predetermined time interval (see page 2, par. 29; page 4, par. 68; Figure 3).
- A light beam having a predetermined features such as color, shapes, brightness, and manners of lighting on (plurality of command features) and a control unit (12d) capable to store in a memory a program to correlate light beam and command signals to drive the robot to a relative position (see page 2, par. 33-34; page 5, par 69-71; Figure 3)

However, Paromtchik fails to teach a method of controlling a robot system comprising the steps of determining whether the reflecting trace is in accordance with the command pattern; and controlling the mobile robot to operate according to the command corresponding to the command pattern when the reflecting trace is in accordance with the command pattern.

However, Bartsch teaches a home cleaning robot comprising a data structure, (program or command) stored in a memory. This data is not limited to a stored schedule of function such as the number of encoder pulse per unit time from each of the locomotion motor, the compass direction per unit time, or relative position coordinates.

Art Unit: 3664

For instance, triangulated position from sonar, light, or other beacon means, and other stored or calculated data against which real time sensor inputs can be compared to guide a mobile (see col. 6, 34-60).

Furthermore, Paromtchik discloses a light beam having a predetermined features that are projected on the surface on which mobile bodies are to be transferred in an environment and a control unit (12d) to process sensor (12a) data and generate command signals to a server unit (12b) to move the robot to a relative position (see page 5, par 69-71; Figure 3). Furthermore, Paromtchik discloses a method for determining the feature of the light beacon such as color, shapes, brightness, and manners of lighting (see page 2, par. 33-34) and for controlling the motion of a robot by processing optical signal (sensor unit (12a)) received from the reflected light beam and calculating the relative coordinate of positions where the light beacons reside (see page 2, par. 33; page 5, par 69-71; Figure 3).

A person of ordinary skill in the art, upon reading Paromtchik's reference would have recognized the desirability of an improved control unit function for a mobile body system. Bartsch's reference teaches a memory unit to store data structure for a guiding robot by comparing sonar, light or other beacon signals with stored command. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the memory unit and its process (Bartsch's invention) in an attempt to provide an improved robotic control system. Under this process, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to understand that the robotic control unit would drive the robot in

Art Unit: 3664

accordance to its stored data structure by comparing the received light signal with the stored command.

Doing so would enhance a mobile robot navigation system capable to reduce navigation error due to external light source and optimize the robot performance.

Regarding **claims 11-13**, Paromtchik fails to disclose a method wherein when the reflecting trace is not in accordance with the command pattern and draws a line segment, the mobile robot is controlled to move along the line segment, wherein when the reflecting trace is not in accordance with the command pattern and draws a closed loop, the mobile robot is controlled to enter an area formed by the closed loop, and wherein when the reflecting trace is not in accordance with the command pattern and points to a point, the mobile robot is controlled to move to the point

However, as Paromtchik discloses a light beam having a predetermined features such as color, shapes, brightness, and manners of lighting on (plurality of command features) and a control unit (12d) capable to store in a memory a program to correlate light beam and command signals to drive the robot to a relative position (see page 2, par. 33-34; page 5, par 69-71; Figure 3), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement light beams to draw close loop and point to point features to command the robot to enter the close loop area or approach the point feature. Furthermore, as the robot implement optical devices such infrared sensor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to adjust the computer program to ignore/eliminate external

reflected trace such as sun and lamp lights to allow the robot to complete its trajectory (moving along a line segment).

Doing so would enhance a mobile robot navigation system capable to reduce navigation error due to external light source and optimize the robot performance.

Response to Argument

In the Applicant's arguments/remarks filed on April 15, 2008, with respect to **claims 10-13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paromtchik et al. (Pub No.: US 2002/0027652 A1)** in view of **Bartsch et al. (Patent No.: US 6,459,955 B1)** have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant first argument (page 5, par. 2 and 4) "It is respectfully submitted that this section of Bartsch, nor any other, discusses the technical feature of claim 10 of combining a plurality of reflecting traces corresponding to a plurality of command patterns storing them as a single command pattern in the memory. Specifically, the Bartsch only discusses manipulation of the robot along a single path without ever discussing that more than one reflecting traces would ever be combined " and "it is respectfully submitted that the technical feature in claim 10 of combining a plurality of reflecting traces corresponding to a plurality of command patterns storing them as a single command pattern in the memory is even more unlikely in Paromtchik because Paromtchik discusses a plurality of robots each operating under their own, separate command pattern." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. A thought reading of Paromtchik in view of Bartsch reveals that what is argued is clearly supported.

Furthermore, the Examiner had considered all claim limitations in his rejection by articulating finding as to the scope and content of the prior art as need to support the obviousness rejection being made. Applicant is kindly invited to consider the references as a whole, and for this argument, concentrate on Paromtchik's page 2, par. 33-34; page 5, par 69-71; Figure 3 and on Bartsch's abstract, col. 2, line 58 – col. 3, line 18; col. 6, lines 34-60. Furthermore, Applicant is kindly invited to view the above rejection in respond to this argument for more detail explanation.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jorge O. Peche whose telephone number is (571)270-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:30 pm Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi H. Tran can be reached on 571-272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jorge O Peche/

Examiner, Art Unit 3664

July 2, 2008

/Khoi H Tran/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3664